

Appl. No. 10/083,366  
Amendment dated: November 26, 2004  
Reply to OA of: July 29, 2004

### **REMARKS**

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the interview extended the undersigned attorney at which time the outstanding issues were discussed with the Examiner in an effort to clarify the claimed invention and to more clearly define the invention as it would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains.

At the interview the objection to the disclosure concerning the unfamiliar unit abbreviated "i m" was discussed and it was pointed out that this was a computer error for  $\mu\text{m}$ , as would be appreciated by one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains. The specification has been amended to correct this obvious error. A similar amendment was previously made with respect to the claimed subject matter. This amendment does not raise a new issue and entry is in order and is most respectfully requested.

It was also noted at the interview and is referred to at the bottom of page 3 of the Official Action, some clarification with respect to the working examples is required and the examples in the specification have been amended. Upon a detailed study of these examples, it is clear that the experimental example 1, preparation example, describes the preparation of the aniline monomer and oligomer solution used in the comparative examples of the present invention.

Comparative examples 2, 3 and 4 have been renamed as comparative examples and the content of these examples have been clarified. These examples do not describe the method in accordance with the presently claimed invention as is evident from the low electrical conductivity achieved by these comparative examples.

Finally, experimental example 5, comparative example has been renamed as example 1 since this is the only example in accordance with the presently invention. Necessary and obvious corrections have been made to the examples for purposes of clarification. These amendments neither introduce new matter nor create new issues for further consideration by the Examiner.

Appl. No. 10/083,366  
Amendment dated: November 26, 2004  
Reply to OA of: July 29, 2004

In this regard, it is evident from the Official Action and the interview that the Examiner is an experienced examiner and has appreciated the inventive aspect of the invention. The Examiner's helpful comments in the Official Action are very much appreciated. The Examiner is correct in the intended meaning for claim 29 and this claim has been canceled and the definition thereof has been inserted into claim 25. That is, in step (b) of claim 25 the field effect control is selected from the group consisting of a microwave field, an electrical field, a magnetic field, a fluid force field or combinations thereof.

In addition, step (c) of claim 25 has been similarly amended taking into consideration the Examiner's comments on the bottom of page 2 of the Official Action. It is believed that these amendments to claim 25 obviate all of the outstanding rejections under 35 USC 112. Moreover, the addition of the limitations from claims 29 and 31 do not create a new issue requiring further search. Therefore, entry of the amendment is in order and is most respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 25-29 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed.

In claim 25, the phrase "field functional control" has been deleted from the claim and replaced with "field effect control". The limitations from claims 29 and 31 have been added to claim 25 and it is believed that these amendments obviate the rejection under 35 USC 112.

The Examiner asks in the Official Action, would intended meaning from claim 29 correspond to –wherein the field in the field function control of step (b) is selected from the group consisting of a microwave field, an electrical field, a magnetic field, a fluid force field or combinations thereof—the answer is yes.

The Examiner further questions in claim 25 what "combination means in the phrase "electromagnetic combination field". Applicants intended the meaning to combine two or three of the electrical field, microwave field, fluid force field and the magnetic field. Moreover, they can be totally combined or individual and the claim has been so amended.

Appl. No. 10/083,366  
Amendment dated: November 26, 2004  
Reply to OA of: July 29, 2004

With respect to the phrase "molecules structure ordered filed control" and "self-stacking field control", Applicants wish to convey that the molecules can stack up spontaneously and the structure of the molecules will demonstrate sequential order by filed effect control.


Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 be withdrawn in view of the amendments to the claims.

As noted, Applicants believe that the claims now present in the application are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112. However, should the Examiner see any further amendments which may be necessary for further clarification, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss what, if any, further amendments are necessary to place the claims in proper form since it is believed that the claims as now amended, clearly distinguish over the prior art.

In view of the above comments and further amendments to the claims, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all the claims now present in the application are most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

By:   
Richard E. Fichter  
Registration No. 26,382

625 Slaters Lane, 4<sup>th</sup> Fl.  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Phone: (703) 683-0500  
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

REF:kdd  
A03.wpd

November 26, 2004